

Appl. No. : 09/550,545
Filed : April 14, 2000

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None

Identification of Claims Discussed

Claim 15 and Claim 25 were discussed.

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent No. 6,356,971 to Katz et al. ("the Katz Reference") and U.S. Patent No. 5,831,613 to Johnson et al. ("the Johnson Reference") were discussed.

Proposed Amendments

None

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

Applicants discussed the lack of the claimed features in the Katz Reference and the Johnson Reference. A copy of the Examiner's summary is also attached hereto.

Results of Interview

No agreement was reached.

Appl. No. : 09/550,545
Filed : April 14, 2000

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his examination of the present application. By way of summary, Claims 15-19, 25-27, and 29-66 were pending in this application. In the Office Action mailed April 6, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 15-19, 25-27, and 29-66. In particular, the Examiner rejected Claims 15-19, 26-27, 29-33, 35-43, 45-56, 59-60, and 63-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,356,971 to Katz ("Katz"). In addition, the Examiner rejected Claims 25, 34, 44, 57-58, and 61-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,831,631 to Johnston ("Johnson").

This Amendment amends Claims 15-19, 29-33, 37-41, 45-49, 57-58, and 61-62 and adds Claims 67-74. Thus, after entry of this Amendment, Claims 15-19, 25-27, and 29-74 remain pending.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 15-19, 26-27, 29-33, 35-43, 45-56, 59-60, AND 63-66 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 15-19, 26-27, 29-33, 35-43, 45-56, 59-60, and 63-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,356,971 to Katz ("Katz"). In view of the arguments above and the following discussion, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and the Examiner's characterization of the cited reference. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as originally pending are patentably distinguished over Katz. Claims 15-19, 29-33, 37-41, and 45-49, however, have been amended without altering their scope in order to clarify the features of Applicants' inventions. These claim amendments are not made for patentability purposes, and it is believed that the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 15-19, 26-27, 29-33, 35-43, 45-56, 59-60, and 63-66 are patentably distinguished over the cited reference and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 15-19, 26-27, 29-33, 35-43, 45-56, 59-60, and 63-66.

1. Independent Claims 15-19

With respect to Claims 15-19, the Examiner argues that Katz discloses all of the elements of Claims 15-19. Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, Katz does not disclose "a memory comprising a plurality of nodes indicating music item classifications," "an input device

Appl. No. : 09/550,545
Filed : April 14, 2000

comprising at least one of a keyboard, a rollerball, a pen, a stylus, a touchscreen, a microphone, and a mouse,” “an output device operative to display a hierarchical graphical library tree, the hierarchical graphical library tree graphically depicting the nodes, one or more of the nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree having a plurality of children nodes that relate to the node and/or one or more music track(s), each node in the plurality of nodes being represented by either a graphical image or text,” or “the output device having a graphical display indicating (a) a child node of the plurality of children nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree, and/or (b) music track information related to the child node, the child node and/or the music track information being operative to be movable or copyable from a first location where the child node and/or music track information indicates an association with one of the plurality of nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree to one of a plurality of user-indicated second locations where the child node and/or music track information indicates an association with another of the plurality of nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree and the moving or copying to the one of the plurality of user-indicated second locations is operative to be performed in response to a signal from the input device used to indicate a move or a copy of the child node and/or the music track from the first location to the second location in the hierarchical graphical library tree.”

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Katz fails to disclose the claimed subject matter of Claims 15-19, including each element of Claims 15-19, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 15-19 be withdrawn.

2. Dependent Claims 26-27, 54-56, and 63

Claims 26-27, 54-56, and 63, which depend from independent Claim 15 and include all the limitations of Claim 15, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 15 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Since Katz fails to disclose every element of Claims 26-27, 54-56, and 63, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 26-27, 54-56, and 63 be withdrawn.

3. Independent Claims 29-33

With respect to Claims 29-33, the Examiner argues that Katz discloses all of the elements of Claims 29-33 referring to the arguments made with respect to Claim 15. Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, Katz does not disclose “indicating music item classifications with a plurality of nodes with the output device,” “displaying the nodes on the output device with

Appl. No. : 09/550,545
Filed : April 14, 2000

a hierarchical graphical library tree," "displaying adjacent one or more of the nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree a plurality of children nodes that relate to the node and/or one or more music track(s)," "displaying at a location on the output device each node in the plurality of nodes with either a graphical image or text symbols," "displaying on the output device one of the children nodes in the plurality of children nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree, and/or the music track information related to at least one of the children node," or "moving or copying one of the children node(s) and/or music track information from a first location on the output device where at least one of the children node(s) and/or music track information indicates an association with one of the plurality of nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree to one of a plurality of user-indicated second locations where the at least one of the children node(s) and/or music track information indicates an association with another of the plurality of nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree, in response to a signal from an input device used to indicate a move or a copy of the at least one of the children node(s) and/or the music track information from the first location to the second location in the hierarchical graphical library tree, the input device comprising at least one of a keyboard, a rollerball, a pen, a stylus, a touchscreen, a microphone, and a mouse."

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Katz fails to disclose the claimed subject matter of Claims 29-33, including each element of Claims 29-33, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 29-33 be withdrawn.

4. Dependent Claims 35-36, 59, and 64

Claims 35-36, 59, and 64 which depend from independent Claim 29 and include all the limitations of Claim 29, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 29 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Since Katz fails to disclose every element of Claims 35-36, 59, and 64, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 35-36, 59, and 64 be withdrawn.

5. Independent Claims 37-41

With respect to Claims 37-41, the Examiner argues that Katz discloses all of the elements of Claims 37-41 referring to the arguments made with respect to Claims 37-41 as well as additional arguments. Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, Katz does not disclose "computer readable program code for causing said client electronic device to display on said

Appl. No. : 09/550,545
Filed : April 14, 2000

client electronic device music item classifications with a plurality of nodes using either a graphical image or text symbols," "computer readable program code for causing said client electronic device to display on said client electronic device with a hierarchical graphical library tree the plurality of nodes and a plurality of children nodes, wherein at least one of the plurality of children nodes relates to at least one music track accessible by the client electronic device and a placement of each of the plurality of children nodes within the hierarchical graphical library tree indicates an association with one of the plurality of nodes," "computer readable program code for causing said client electronic device to move or copy the display of at least one of the plurality of children nodes or at least one music track from a first location, where the at least one of the plurality of children nodes or the at least one music track indicates an association with one of the plurality of nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree, to one of a plurality of user-indicated second locations where the at least one of the plurality of children nodes or the at least one music track indicates an association with another of the plurality of nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree, the moving or copying being performed in response to a signal from an input device used to indicate a move or a copy of the at least one of the plurality of children nodes or the at least one music track from the first location to the second location in the hierarchical graphical library tree, the input device comprising at least one of a keyboard, a rollerball, a pen, a stylus, a touchscreen, a microphone, and a mouse."

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Katz fails to disclose the claimed subject matter of Claims 37-41, including each element of Claims 37-41, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 37-41 be withdrawn.

6. Dependent Claims 42-43, 60, and 65

Claims 42-43, 60, and 65, which depend from independent Claim 37 and include all the limitations of Claim 37, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 37 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Since Katz fails to disclose every element of Claims 42-43, 60, and 65, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 42-43, 60, and 65 be withdrawn.

7. Independent Claims 45-49

With respect to Claims 45-49, the Examiner argues that Katz discloses all of the elements of Claims 45-49 referring to the arguments made with respect to Claims 45-49 as well as

Appl. No. : 09/550,545
Filed : April 14, 2000

additional arguments. Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, Katz does not disclose "computer readable program code for causing said client electronic device to display on said client electronic device music item classifications with a plurality of nodes using either a graphical image or text symbols," "computer readable program code for causing said client electronic device to display on said client electronic device with a hierarchical graphical library tree the plurality of nodes and a plurality of children nodes, wherein each of the plurality of children nodes relates to one or more music track(s) accessible by the client electronic device and a placement of each of the plurality of children nodes within the hierarchical graphical library tree indicates an association with one of the plurality of nodes," "computer readable program code for causing said client electronic device to receive a signal from an input device, the input device comprising at least one of a keyboard, a rollerball, a pen, a stylus, a touchscreen, a microphone, and a mouse, the signal indicating selection of a first child node of the plurality of children nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree and to display on said client electronic device, upon selection of the first child node of the plurality of children nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree, one or more music track(s) associated with the first child node of the plurality of children nodes and accessible by the client electronic device," "computer readable program code for causing said client electronic device to change the association of at least one of the one or more music track(s) from a first child node of the plurality of children nodes to a second child node of the plurality of children nodes," "computer readable program code for causing said client electronic device to receive a signal indicating a user-indicated selection of the second child node of a plurality of children nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree and to display on said client electronic device, upon selection of the second child node of the plurality of children nodes in the hierarchical graphical library tree, the at least one of the one or more music track(s)," or "computer readable program code for receiving a signal indication of a selection of one of the one or more music track(s) the nodes and for causing the music track corresponding to the selected node to be rendered when the track is selected."

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Katz fails to disclose the claimed subject matter of Claims 45-49, including each element of Claims 45-49, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 45-49 be withdrawn.

Appl. No. : 09/550,545
Filed : April 14, 2000

8. Dependent Claims 50-52 and 66

Claims 50-52 and 66, which depend from independent Claim 45 and include all the limitations of Claim 45, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 45 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Since Katz fails to disclose every element of Claims 50-52 and 66, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 50-52 and 66 be withdrawn.

9. Dependent Claim 53

Claim 53, which depends from independent Claim 46 and includes all the limitations of Claim 46, is believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 46 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Since Katz fails to disclose every element of Claim 53, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 53 be withdrawn.

10. Summary

Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner pass Claims 15-19, 26-27, 29-33, 35-43, 45-56, 59-60, and 63-66 to allowance.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 25, 34, 44, 57-58, and 61-62 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 25, 34, 44, 57-58, and 61-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,831,631 to Johnston ("Johnson"). In view of the arguments above and the following discussion, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and the Examiner's characterization of the cited references because Katz, alone or in combination with Johnson, fails to teach or suggest the elements of the claims. See M.P.E.P. § 2143 (stating that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for a claim, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations). Thus, to sustain the foregoing rejections of Claims 25, 34, 44, 57-58, and 61-52, Katz alone or in combination with Johnson, must identically teach or suggest every element of Claims 25, 34, 44, 57-58, and 61-52, which it does not.

1. Dependent Claims 25 and 57

Claims 25 and 57, which depend from independent Claim 15 and include all the limitations of Claim 15, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 15 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein.

Appl. No. : 09/550,545
Filed : April 14, 2000

Since Katz, alone or in combination with Johnson, fails to disclose every element of Claims 25 and 57, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 25 and 57 be withdrawn.

2. Dependent Claims 34 and 58

Claims 34 and 58, which depend from independent Claim 29 and include all the limitations of Claim 29, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 29 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein.

Since Katz, alone or in combination with Johnson, fails to disclose every element of Claims 34 and 58, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 34 and 58 be withdrawn.

3. Dependent Claims 44 and 61

Claims 44 and 61, which depend from independent Claim 37 and include all the limitations of Claim 37, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 37 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein.

Since Katz, alone or in combination with Johnson, fails to disclose every element of Claims 44 and 61, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 44 and 61 be withdrawn.

4. Dependent Claim 62

Claim 62, which depends from independent Claim 45 and includes all the limitations of Claim 45, is believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 45 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein.

Since Katz, alone or in combination with Johnson, fails to disclose every element of Claims 62, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 62 be withdrawn.

5. Summary

Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner pass Claims 25, 34, 44, 57-58, and 61-62 to allowance.

C. NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 67-74 have been added to more fully define the Applicants' invention and are believed to be fully distinguished over the prior art of record. Claims 67 and 68, which depend from Claim 16 and include all of the limitations of Claim 16, are believed to be

Appl. No. : 09/550,545
Filed : April 14, 2000

patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 16 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Claims 69 and 70, which depend from Claim 17 and include all of the limitations of Claim 17, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 17 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Claims 71 and 72, which depend from Claim 18 and include all of the limitations of Claim 18, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 18 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein. Claims 73 and 74, which depend from Claim 19 and include all of the limitations of Claim 19, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated above with respect to Claim 19 and because of the additional limitations set forth therein.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner pass Claims 67-74 to allowance.

D. SUPPLEMENTAL IDS

The Applicants submit herewith a copy of the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement which came to the Applicants' attention that was previously submitted on November 21, 2005 and on January 20, 2006. Copies of the CDRM and the accompanying document are not included because they were previously submitted. If the Examiner would like another copy, Applicants would be glad to submit a copy at the Examiner's request. While the Applicants do not believe that these references will affect the patentability of the pending claims, the Applicants respectfully request the consideration of the same.

E. REQUEST FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 713.01, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants' undersigned attorney of record hereby formally requests a telephone interview with the Examiner as soon as the Examiner has considered the effect of the arguments presented above. Applicants' attorney can be reached at (949) 721-7603 or at the number listed below.

F. CONCLUSION

In view of the forgoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If further issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that any remaining issues may

Appl. No. : 09/550,545
Filed : April 14, 2000

be promptly resolved. Also, please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: Sept 5, 2006

By: Amy Christensen
Amy C. Christensen
Registration No. 52,742
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

2790327://rc1
090506

COPY



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1458
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,545	04/14/2000	Shawn Sootzin	REALNET.055A	8286
20995	7590	07/20/2006	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			FLANDERS, ANDREW C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2615	

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/550.545	SCOTZIN ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew C. Flanders	2815	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Andrew C. Flanders (3) Steven Stewart

(2) Amy C. Christensen (4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 July 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 15 and 25.

Identification of prior art discussed: Katz (U.S. Patent 6,366,971) and Johnston (U.S. Patent 5,831,613).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135, (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiner's Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner.
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413)

Application No. 09/530,545

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed differences between Applicant's claim 15 and the Katz reference. The Examiner explained the reasoning behind the rejection specifically the portion of the rejection regarding the moving and copying using the input and the hierarchical graphical library tree. Also discussed the dragging and dropping claimed in claim 25 and how the combination of Katz in view of Johnston was applied. It was the Examiners position that while the inventions appear to differ, the language presented in the claims does not distinguish Katz from Applicant's claimed invention. No amendments to overcome the art were proposed and no indication of allowable subject matter was given. Any new amendments or issues would require further search and or consideration to determine allowability or to determine if they will overcome the current prior art.



SINH TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Docket No.: REALNET.055A

Customer No. 20,995

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

COPY



Applicant : Scotzin, et al.
App. No : 09/550,545
Filed : April 14, 2000
For : A SYSTEM AND METHOD OF
PROVIDING MUSIC ITEMS TO
MUSIC RENDERERS
Examiner : Andrew R. Graham
Art Unit : 2644

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Enclosed for filing in the above-identified application is a PTO/SB/08 Equivalent listing 2 references to be considered by the Examiner. Also enclosed are 2 foreign patent references and/or non-patent literature as listed on the Information Disclosure Statement.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(g) and (h), Applicants make no representation that the information is considered to be material to patentability. Additionally, inclusion on this list is not an admission that any of the cited documents are prior art in this application. Further, Applicants make no representation regarding the completeness of this list, nor represent that better art does not exist.

This Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is being filed within three months of the filing date, with an RCE or before receipt of a first office action after an RCE and no fee is required.

Appl. No. : 09/550,545
Filed : April 14, 2000

Docket No. REALNET.055A
Customer No. 20,995

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: Jan. 20, 2006

By: Amy Christensen
Amy C. Christensen
Registration No. 52,742
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

2313343
012006

PTO/SB/08 Equivalent

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT (Multiple sheets used when necessary) SHEET 1 OF 1	Application No.	09/550,545
	Filing Date	April 14, 2000
	First Named Inventor	Scotzn, et al.
	Art Unit	2644
	Examiner	Andrew R. Graham
	Attorney Docket No.	REALNET.055A

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS					
Examiner Initials	Cite No.	Document Number Number - Kind Code (if known) Example: 1,234,567 B1	Publication Date MM-DD-YYYY	Name of Patentee or Applicant	Pages, Columns, Lines Where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS						
Examiner Initials	Cite No.	Foreign Patent Document Country Code-Number-Kind Code Example: JP 1234567 A1	Publication Date MM-DD-YYYY	Name of Patentee or Applicant	Pages, Columns, Lines Where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear	T ¹

NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS			
Examiner Initials	Cite No.	Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.), date, page(s), volume-issue, number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published.	T ¹
	1	Whatsnew MP3 Explorer Supanova Software Version 2.0, from http://www.millstone.demon.co.uk/zips/mp3exp20.zip , January 3, 1999	
	2	CD with copy of MP3 Supanova MP3 Explorer, from http://www.millstone.demon.co.uk/zips/mp3exp20.zip , January 3, 1999	
	3		
	4		
	5		

2309093
011808

Examiner Signature	Date Considered
*Examiner: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.	

T¹ - Place a check mark in this area when an English language Translation is attached.

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.